

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **1.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alvesalo, *et al.* (US 2002/0186710) in view of Halvorson (US 6,208,859). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. The Examiner's favorable reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Applicant's claimed invention reduces or eliminates the need to reallocate substreams for **a specific mobile call connection** by determining and allocating the highest number of substreams for the mobile radio connection. In accordance with teachings of the present invention, any substreams for the mobile radio connection that have become unused are retained during the duration of that specific mobile connection. The retained substreams may then later be used in the event the quality of the radio interface for that mobile connection later improves without reallocating new substreams or interrupting the TRAU frame synchronization at the BSC and BTS nodes.

Alvesalo discloses the dynamic distribution of capacity between networks. The Examiner states that Alvesalo discloses setting an upper limit for transmission capacity such as frequency, resources, channels and sub-streams allocated to a network. However, Alvesalo is concerned with the allocation of resources over an entire network and does not teach or suggest the allocation of the resources for a specific mobile radio connection. The Examiner cites paragraph 18 of Alvesalo which states "In one embodiment, a given minimum capacity wherewith the network achieves a predetermined minimum quality for its service is permanently allocated to some or all of the networks. As the capacity requirement increases, the necessary amount of additional capacity requirement increases, the necessary amount of additional capacity is allocated to the operator in excess of this minimum capacity. In such a case, the additional capacity is allocated either from resources separately reserved for this purpose that are common to the network or by borrowing it from capacity that is allocated to another network but falls outside the minimum capacity of said network." This passage clearly shows that Alvesalo allocates resources across one or more networks and does not teach or suggest the reservation of resources for a specific

mobile radio connection. Additionally, Alvesalo states that a minimum capacity is set and if necessary, other network resources may be utilized. This is contrary to the Applicant's claimed invention which sets a highest number of substreams for use with the specific mobile radio connection. Likewise, in the other passages cited by the Examiner in Alvesalo, all the resources are allocated across the network rather than allocating a specific maximum number for a specific mobile radio connection.

Halvorson discloses a satellite mobile radio communication system which defines and distributes channels by utilizing a channel pool. The channel pool is associated with a network or system. Halvorson does not teach or suggest a setting a highest number of substreams for a specific mobile radio connection. Halvorson merely discloses channel allocation across a network. Halvorson does not disclose retaining any allocated substreams for use for the mobile radio connection.

In addition, neither Halvorson nor Alvesalo discuss the problems associated with interruption times related to A-TRAU and E-TRAU frame synchronization by requiring the provisioning of new substreams to accommodate a specific mobile radio connection. Both Halvorson and Alvesalo allocate resources based on a pool of resources held in reserve for the entire network rather than for a specific mobile radio connection.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-11 are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 1-11.

Claims 12-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alvesalo, *et al.* (US 2002/0186710) in view of Halvorson (US 6,208,859) and further in view of Lin, *et al.* (US 6,633,555). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. The Examiner's favorable reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

As stated above, the Applicant's claimed invention reduces or eliminates the need to reallocate substreams for a specific mobile call connection by determining and allocating the highest number of substreams for a mobile radio connection. In accordance with teachings of the present invention, any substreams for the mobile radio connection that have become unused are retained during the duration of that specific

mobile radio connection. The retained substreams may then later be used in the event the quality of the radio interface for that mobile radio connection later improves without reallocating new substreams or interrupting the TRAU frame synchronization at the BSC and BTS nodes.

As discussed above, Alvesalo discloses the dynamic distribution of capacity between networks and does not teach or suggest the allocation of resources for a particular mobile radio connection. Additionally, Alvesalo states that a minimum capacity is set and if necessary, than other network resources may be utilized. This is contrary to the Applicant's claimed invention which sets a highest number of substreams for use with the specific mobile radio connection.

Halvorson merely discloses a satellite mobile radio communication system which defines and distributes channels by utilizing a channel pool. The channel pool is associated with a network or system. Halvorson does not teach or suggest a setting a highest number of substreams for a specific mobile radio connection. Halvorson merely discloses channel allocation across a network. Halvorson does not disclose retaining any allocated substreams for use by the mobile radio connection.

Lin does not make up the missing elements of Halvorson and Alvesalo. Lin merely discloses monitoring air interface interference and the allocation of these resources for a plurality of users.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-22 are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 12-22.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Cameron', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael Cameron  
Registration No. 50,298

Date: January 15, 2007

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145  
michael.cameron@ericsson.com